

when compared to the magnitude of the threat we face. This is not a give-away program for Russia and other independent states of the former Soviet Union. These expenditures serve our interests.

Mr. President, we are already on borrowed time. We are fortunate that an attack involving weapons of mass destruction has not yet occurred on U.S. soil. But we cannot continue to rely on fate to prevent the proliferation of these deadly weapons.

This amendment offers us a substantive means to act, prevent, and prepare against the menace of weapons of mass destruction. I urge its adoption.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to amendment No. 4349. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRIST). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Abraham	Frahm	Lugar
Akaka	Frist	Mack
Baucus	Glenn	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Gramm	Moynihan
Boxer	Grams	Murkowski
Bradley	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatch	Pell
Burns	Hatfield	Pressler
Byrd	Hefflin	Pryor
Campbell	Helms	Reid
Chafee	Hollings	Robb
Coats	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Cochran	Inhofe	Roth
Cohen	Inouye	Santorum
Conrad	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Johnston	Shelby
Craig	Kassebaum	Simon
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Simpson
Daschle	Kennedy	Smith
DeWine	Kerrey	Snowe
Dodd	Kerry	Specter
Domenici	Kohl	Stevens
Dorgan	Kyl	Thomas
Exon	Lautenberg	Thompson
Faircloth	Leahy	Thurmond
Feingold	Levin	Warner
Feinstein	Lieberman	Wellstone
Ford	Lott	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Ashcroft	Bumpers
Bond	McCain

The amendment [No. 4349] was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CLOTURE VOTE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote to begin immediately be postponed to occur later today at a time to be determined by the two leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, it is the hope of the leadership the Senate can reach a consent agreement that will limit the number of amendments that remain in order to the DOD authorization bill.

While these negotiations are continuing and an effort is being made to identify the amendments that are serious and need to be offered and dealt with or voted on, we are trying to suspend the cloture vote to give us time to get this list worked up. If we can, then the cloture vote will not be necessary and could be vitiated.

So I urge the Senators to come forward now. It is Thursday morning. We would like to finish up before too late tonight, but if we do not, we will be here tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the majority leader for the statement he has made, and I am in accord with him.

Mr. GREGG. Will the leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I would like to note for the RECORD, Senators BOND and ASHCROFT were unavoidably absent at the last vote due to the attendance of the funeral of Congressman Emerson.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. PRYOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair as to what the pending business is of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Warner amendment No. 4350.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Warner amendment be temporarily set aside.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Bill Parlett, a congressional fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of the Department of Defense authorization bill, S. 1745, and that immediately after the approval of this unanimous consent request we go back into a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank Senator PRYOR and Senator HELMS for their forbearance and consideration in allowing the quorum call to be called off. I promise that I will reinstitute the quorum call upon the completion of my remarks.

ALCOHOL INDUSTRY ADVERTISING

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a time when our Nation is working to curb alcohol abuse. I am troubled by a disturbing step backward by at least one member of the alcohol industry that I consider a significant threat to our society. There has been much recent opposition expressed by other Members of Congress to the Joseph E. Seagram & Sons Corp. blatant violation of a liquor industry advertising ban.

In 1948, the liquor industry in this country adopted a code of good practice, a self-imposed decision not to advertise distilled spirits products over the airwaves of the emerging radio and television technology. In the past 38 years that I have been a U.S. Senator, liquor companies have voluntarily complied with that agreement, abstaining from advertising on the influential mediums of radio and television—until now.

Earlier this month, Seagram Corp. began airing commercials for its Crown Royal Canadian Whiskey on a television station in Texas, defiantly breaking the industry's promise to our country, and self-indulgently putting sales dollars ahead of the future of our children.

I have long decried the quality of much of television programming. The overwhelming influences of television

on our Nation have contributed mightily to the moral decay in our communities. No group is affected more by the irreverent programming than our children. In all too many homes, today's youth are reared by the "electronic babysitter." Studies show that the average child will view 25,000 hours of programming by the age of 18. While this broadcasting brew is already being polluted by commercials from the beer and wine industries, it is even more important to guard against mixing hard liquor ads into the cauldron.

The Seagram commercial not only defies the industry's own longtime agreement, but it also aims to appeal to a younger audience. The liquor advertisement portrays two dogs graduating from "obedience" school. One holds a mere newspaper, while the other carries a bottle of Crown Royal. The canine with the newspaper is labeled simply "graduate," while the other dog with a bottle of whiskey is titled "valedictorian."

In addition to the youth appeal of animal characters, the propaganda is further propelled by the background tune "Pomp and Circumstance," recognized as the music played at countless high school and college graduations this time of year.

I find it reprehensible that the Seagram Corp. would associate academic achievement with hard liquor. Think of it; associating academic achievement with hard liquor. How preposterous.

Alcohol is the No. 1 drug problem among young Americans—and some older ones as well. It is the leading cause of death and injury for teenagers and young adults. Drinking impairs one's judgment. And alcohol mixed with teenage driving is a lethal combination.

The Senate recently approved an amendment which I introduced that requires States to adopt a zero tolerance standard for drivers under the nationwide legal drinking age of 21. The zero tolerance law corrects a loophole to help ensure that underage drivers who register blood alcohol levels as low as .02 percent are subject to State imposed drunk driving sanctions.

This action not only will help to save lives—and it may be your life, and it may be your life, and it may be your life to save—but it will also serve to send a message, the right message, to our Nation's youth that drinking and driving just will not work.

I have been asked upon some occasions to participate in advertising that would say, "Do not drink and drive." I did not say "Do not drink and drive." I said, "Do not drink, period. Do not drink, period." There is nothing good in it. Alcohol consumption leads to a higher crime rate. It is a contributing factor in assaults, murders, and other violent crimes.

As a member of the West Virginia State Senate in 1951, I requested of the warden of the West Virginia Penitentiary that I be a witness at the execution of a young man by the name of

James Hewlett. James Hewlett was from Fayette County, a neighboring county to my own county of Raleigh in West Virginia.

Hewlett had asked a cabdriver to take him from Huntington to Logan. On the way to Logan, Hewlett shot the cabdriver in the back, robbed him, dumped his body by the side of the road, and went on his own way with the cab. He was later apprehended in a theater at Montgomery, West Virginia. He was sentenced to die in the electric chair.

For months he rejected the idea of having a chaplain in his cell. But as the months and weeks and days went by, and Governor Patten of West Virginia declined to commute his sentence, Hewlett knew that he was going to have to die, and he asked for a chaplain to be with him in his cell.

On this particular occasion, I drove from Charleston, the capital, to Moundsville where the West Virginia Penitentiary is located.

I asked the warden if I might go down and talk with Jim Hewlett in his cell. About an hour before the execution, I was allowed to enter the cell of Jim Hewlett. I shook his hand, and shook hands with the chaplain in his cell.

I said to Hewlett, "From time to time I speak to young people; Boy Scout groups, Girl Scout groups, 4-H clubs. I wonder if you might have a message that I can pass on to these young people as I have an opportunity to visit and speak with them around the State." He said, "Tell them to go to Sunday school and church." He said, "If I had gone, I might not be here tonight."

We exchanged a few more words. And as I was about to leave, he said, "Tell them one more thing. Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank." "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

I have told that story many times to young people around my State.

"Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank." Those were Hewlett's exact words.

I said, "What do you mean by that?" The chaplain broke in, and said, "You see that little crack in the wall up there?" He said, "If he were to take a drink right now, he would try to get through that little crack in the wall. That is how alcohol affects him."

I then said goodbye to Mr. Hewlett and to the chaplain, went on back to the warden's office, and at 9 o'clock he called us up to his desk. And he said, "We will now go over to the death chamber. If you have cameras leave them here. There will be no picture taking, and when the execution is over we will return here."

I witnessed the execution.

Several years later I was in the northern panhandle of West Virginia, and someone suggested to me that I go down and see the local priest who was very ill. I did not know the priest. I did not recognize the name. It was Father

Farrell. So I got the directions and drove down to see Father Farrell. He was very ill. But we talked a little while.

And how I came to tell this story, I do not know how it occurred to me to tell this particular story. I had never seen Father Farrell before, to my recollection. So I told the story, and he listened very carefully. When I had finished telling the story of witnessing this execution and having visited the cell of Jim Hewlett prior to the execution, Father Farrell said, "Yes. That is the way it was. You see, I was the chaplain in the cell that night when you visited Jim Hewlett," which shows that there is, indeed, a wheel that turns, and we never know when we will see someone in later years whom we have met before, perhaps in some distant land and different clime.

The point here is that this young man, who stood staring death and eternity in the face, said, "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

So alcohol consumption leads to a higher crime rate. It is a contributing factor, as I say, in assaults and murders and other violent crimes. It was a contributing factor in the crime that was committed by Jim Hewlett. It leads to numerous health problems as well as to the gradual death of habitual drinkers. Oftentimes, it leads not only to the death of the drinker but leads also to the death of someone else—an innocent mother who is driving a car—perhaps, with some children in the car with her. Oftentimes, the intoxicated driver escapes without injury or ends up with only a few bruises after he has killed someone else.

An individual of legal drinking age makes his or her decision to drink, but surely it is careless to impose messages relating valedictorian status—how obnoxious, how obscene, is such a statement—impose messages relating valedictorian status with whiskey and to broadcast these messages through the seducing medium of television.

My concern is for the future quality of life of the citizens of this country. Television's impact on our society is already excessive, bombarding viewers with scenes of violence and obscenity.

Results of one study found that, on average, by the time a child reaches the seventh grade he or she has already been exposed to more than 100,000 assorted acts of violence. And while, in my own estimation, television industry executives have largely failed to exercise proper responsibility for the quality of their shows—as a matter of fact, there are very few shows that have any quality at all, any positive quality; they have, instead, a negative quality—I do give them credit today because, since the ban, the three major broadcasting networks have thus far refused to run hard liquor advertisements, and I encourage them to continue this prudent policy.

The liquor industry's trade association, the Distilled Spirits Council of

the United States, claims that the advertising ban is outdated, old fashioned, and is a throwback to Prohibition era concerns. But distilleries know as well as I know that television has grown increasingly influential in our society, which makes the code of good practice ban more important than it ever was.

As a nation that purports to care about the health, safety and well-being of its people, and as a nation that spends billions of dollars every year on the health care of its people, the very least we can do is to try to address the dangers of alcohol by discouraging the early drinking that often results in later addiction, alcohol dependency, or even more unfortunate consequences.

It is dangerously irresponsible for liquor companies to merchandise their vices using the influential power and looming ubiquity of television. Shame. Shame on the Seagram Corp.—shame on the Seagram Corp.—for defying its own agreement with the people of this country.

I urge every member of the liquor industry to comply with the 48-year-old decision to keep liquor ads off the airwaves—off the airwaves. The health, the well-being, and moral character of our Nation far outweighs the profit that might be generated from broadcast advertisements peddling hard liquor.

Mr. President, "Tell them not to drink the stuff that I drank."

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFF). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. I say to my colleagues, this is only for a speech, after which I will put the quorum call back in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask, on behalf of Senator HARKIN, that Kevin Ayelsworth be accorded the privilege of the floor during debate on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SAVANNAH RIVER SITE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity, while we are in the process of trying to work matters out, so we do not waste the time of the Senate, to discuss the future of a facility that has long been a key component of our Nation's security, the Department of Energy Savannah River Site. I know my colleague, the chairman, the Senator from South Carolina, has been a devoted supporter

of the work being done there for a long time.

Located on the Savannah River in South Carolina along the Georgia/South Carolina border and known locally as just Savannah River, this site is 16 miles from Augusta, GA, and 12 miles from Aiken, SC. The Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator THURMOND, and I have worked together for over 23 years on issues related to Savannah River. He has really been the leader here. We have teamed together over the years to insure that the Savannah River complex meets the Nation's national security needs. Today, I want to address the future of that complex.

The end of the cold war and the signing of two landmark strategic arms reduction treaties will produce dramatic reductions both in the future role of nuclear weapons in our Nation's national security planning, and in the size of our nuclear weapons stockpile. Moreover, the building momentum toward a comprehensive test ban treaty, if it occurs, could eliminate the design and production of new nuclear weapons with new military requirements. Thus, the Department of Energy has begun to reduce the size and complexity of its nuclear weapons production facilities. As part of this process, the Savannah River Site must adapt to the changing national security picture, and must broaden its long-standing focus beyond the production of nuclear weapons materials.

At the close of World War II, the United States was the only nation in the world with the technological capability to design and build nuclear weapons—weapons which became an essential element of our national security and deterrent posture. In the early years of the Atomic Age, the technology was crude and the materials needed for these weapons were scarce. To remedy this situation, the United States embarked on a massive post-war effort to develop a nuclear weapons production complex that could design, test, build, modify, and disassemble nuclear weapons on an industrial scale, and that could produce all the necessary materials, such as plutonium, highly-enriched uranium, and tritium, in the quantities needed to support such a program. In the 1950's, the Atomic Energy Commission, built most of what we know today as the nuclear weapons production complex. This complex, scattered among 13 States and located on thousands of square miles, produced tens of thousands of nuclear warheads over the last half-century. These warheads were the very foundation of our deterrence strategy that, to date, has worked with no weapons being used—and thank God for that.

One of the major facilities of the nuclear weapons production complex is the Savannah River Site. Savannah River consists of over 300 square miles on what was originally farmland in rural South Carolina. This land was ac-

quired by the Atomic Energy Commission from over 1,600 individual owners. Once acquired, the land was taken over by an army of construction workers. Building the facilities was a tremendous task that included relocating a small town. Even today, the remains of house foundations, sidewalks, and streets can still be seen.

Most of the original production facilities at the site were built in just 2 years. These included: five nuclear materials production reactors; two areas for reprocessing and recovering the materials produced in the reactors; facilities for heavy water production; reactor fuel and reactor target facilities; and a large number of support facilities.

E.I. du Pont Co. was asked both to build and to run the facility. Du Pont accepted the challenge, and for the sum of \$1 per year, du Pont constructed and then operated Savannah River for 40 years. Today, a subsidiary of Westinghouse runs Savannah River for the Department of Energy.

Over the last half-century, Savannah River and its 20,000 employees have played a major role in winning the cold war. But that confrontation is now over. As a result, Savannah River, like so many other defense facilities, must find new roles and a new future. What is the future of the Savannah River and what new missions are possible? How can the Nation best utilize the Savannah River Sites—unique talents of its skilled work force and its large and easily accessible physical plant? How can Savannah River draw on its history, its skills, and lessons learned to make a substantial contribution to our national security for the next 50 years? These questions are important to the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, the communities in Georgia and South Carolina affected by the Savannah River complex, and, of course, those dedicated employees who work in that facility.

I believe that there are at least three new and challenging missions for Savannah River: a cleanup technologies mission; an energy and environmental research mission; and a new national security mission.

First, the Cleanup Mission. Over the past 50 years of operation, the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons production complex has generated enormous amounts of waste materials. This has led to extensive environmental contamination of the 17 facilities in 13 States that make up the complex. The challenges facing the Department of Energy as it moves to clean up this complex are enormous. Neither the exact cost nor the timetable for this cleanup is known, but most estimates have been in the hundreds of billions of dollars range, over decades of activity.

Today, cleanup is complicated by the absence of agreed, legally-binding cleanup standards. No one knows for sure what clean really means, or how much cleanup is enough. Identification of the extent of the contamination is